



\$~27

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 1267/2026 & CM APPL. 6273/2026

MUSLIM COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi with Ms. Swati
Jhunjhunwala, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor, Mr. Shivom Sethi,
& Mr. Nandeesh Nanda, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

01.04.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:-

- “a) Pass an appropriate order, direction or writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate writ seeking quashing of the impugned order dated 26.09.2025 passed by the Respondent No.2 whereby the Respondent No.2 has refused the application of recognition for Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) of petitioner institution; and*
- (b) Pass an appropriate order, direction or writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the Respondent No.2/SRC to consider the reply sent vide e-mail dated 19.09.2025 by the Petitioner institute for conducting Integrated Teacher Education course with an annual intake of*



100 students, in the facts and circumstances of the present case and in the interest of justice;

(c) Pass such other further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem it, fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case."

2. Ms. Dwivedi, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that the petitioner has duly submitted the documents though belatedly and not on online portal. She states that in view of her submission of documents, the application of the petitioner be considered afresh.

3. Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel for the respondents, states that the petitioner has an equally efficacious remedy of going to the appeal committee under Section 18 of the NCTE Act, 1993 and the documents were submitted belatedly.

4. However, I am of the view that the recognition/non-recognition of the petitioner for Integrated Teacher Education Programme ("**ITEP**") has serious ramifications. The petitioner was already running a B.A.B.Ed/B.Sc.B.Ed course which was up to 2026 and thereafter, the said courses have been scrapped and ITEP has been introduced.

5. Since, the petitioner did not have the documents and the application was rejected on that ground, no useful purpose would be served by going to the appellate committee.

6. For the said reasons, I am of the view that the petitioner must be given ample opportunity to present its case and since the documents have been submitted, the respondents shall process the application of the petitioner forthwith and pass a speaking order within 2 weeks from today.

7. In case, any document is required, the respondent shall inform the



petitioner in writing and the petitioner shall comply with the same.

8. This order is being passed in the light of peculiar facts of the case and shall not be treated as precedent.

9. The present writ petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

APRIL 1, 2026/NG